UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,064	04/12/2004	Jayasimha Nuggehalli	49986-0538	3972

29989 7590 12/11/2009

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER	
PACHOL, NICHOLAS C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/823,064	NUGGEHALLI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas C. Pachol	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 November 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-9 and 12-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-9 and 12-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12-14, 18, and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2. Applicant's arguments filed 04/10/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive with respect to claims 15-17. In regards to applicant's argument that Hanson "contains no teaching or suggestion of retrieve bitmap data from a printing device," the examiner respectfully disagrees. A bitmap is defined as a memory organization of image file formats used to store digital images. A graphical user interface (GUI) uses bitmaps as a form of storing the images. Hanson, in Column 5, lines 13-22, teaches the menus of the GUI. The menus are comprised of images in order to be displayed to the user. Since GUIs are comprised of images and GUIs typically use bitmaps associated with their images, then the GUI of Hanson would have bitmap data. This bitmap data is part of the driver which is received from the printer. Therefore, the bitmap data is received from the printer. Therefore, Hanson does in fact teach "retrieve bitmap data from a printing device."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins (US 2003/0184782) in view of Shin (US 6,351,320).

Regarding Claim 1, Perkins teaches an apparatus (Page 1, paragraph 1) comprising: a non-volatile storage device (Page 2, paragraph 21);

an application program (Page 1, paragraph 18); and

a printer driver (Page 2, paragraph 21) configured to retrieve configuration data from a printing device (Page 2, paragraph 21), wherein the configuration data includes command data (Page 2, paragraph 21),

cause the configuration data to be stored on the non-volatile storage device (Page 2, paragraph 21), and

use the command data included in the configuration data to translate a first command generated by the application program into a second command supported by the printing device (Page 2, paragraph 22);

use the configuration data to generate one or more graphical user interface objects that are displayed on a graphical user interface in association with the printing of an electronic document (Figure 5 and Page 3, paragraph 35), wherein the one or more graphical user interface objects correspond to installed options (Page 3, paragraph 35, wherein the options are installed in order to be accessed for reach printer), and wherein a second graphical user interface object is displayed on the graphical user interface in

response to a user selecting a first graphical user interface object and the second graphical user interface satisfying a dependency condition (Page 3, paragraph 35).

Perkins does not teach wherein the configuration data includes program logic used by the printer driver; and

the dependency condition to be stored in the program logic data.

However Shin does teach wherein the configuration data includes program logic used by the printer driver (Column 9, lines 25-33);

the dependency condition to be stored in the program logic data (Column 9, lines 25-33, wherein the LUT is stored in relation to the logic data, which relates to the dependency condition. Therefore, the dependency condition is stored in the program logic data, by definition of logic data).

Perkins and Shin are combinable because they both deal with interfaces in regards to printers and printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Perkins with the teachings of Shin for the purpose of providing a memory saving printer driver for controlling output image aspects (Shin: Column 2, lines 63-65).

Regarding Claim 2, Perkins further teaches wherein the printer driver is configured to use the configuration data to facilitate printing of an electronic document (Page 2, paragraph 23).

Regarding Claim 7, Perkins further teaches wherein the configuration data indicates one or more options installed on the printing device (Figure 5 and Page 3, paragraph 35).

Regarding Claim 8, Perkins further teaches wherein the configuration data indicates one or more source trays available on the printing device (Figure 5 and Page 3, paragraph 5, wherein the paper sizes are stored on individual source trays).

Regarding Claim 9, Perkins does not teach wherein the configuration data indicates one or more media types available on the printing device.

However, Shin does teach wherein the configuration data indicates one or more media types available on the printing device (Column 9, lines 50-52).

Perkins and Shin are combinable because they both deal with interfaces in regards to printers and printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Perkins with the teachings of Shin for the purpose of providing a memory saving printer driver for controlling output image aspects (Shin: Column 2, lines 63-65).

5. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins (US 2003/0184782) in view of Shin (US 6,351,320) further in view of Hanson (US 6,148,346).

Regarding Claim 4, Perkins in view of Shin does not teach wherein: configuration data includes bitmap data for the printing device, and the printer driver is configured to cause the bitmap data to be displayed on a graphical user interface in association with the printing of an electronic document.

However, Hanson does teach wherein: configuration data includes bitmap data for the printing device (Column 5, lines 13-22, where the bitmap data is taken as a form of graphical data), and the printer driver is configured to cause the bitmap data to be displayed on a graphical user interface in association with the printing of an electronic document (Column 5, lines 13-22).

Perkins and Hanson are combinable because they are both dealing with a user working with printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Perkins in view of Shin with the teachings of Hanson for the purpose of allowing for two way communications between a computer and a printer (Hanson: Column 2, lines 1-5).

Regarding Claim 5, Perkins in view of Shin does not teach wherein the printer driver is further configured to cause a graphical user interface object to be displayed on a graphical user interface, wherein the graphical user interface object includes a link with a URL associated with bitmap data included in the configuration data stored on the printing device.

However Hanson does teach wherein the printer driver is further configured to cause a graphical user interface object to be displayed on a graphical user interface, wherein the graphical user interface object includes a link with a URL associated with bitmap data included in the configuration data stored on the printing device (Column 5, lines 23-43, where the bitmap data is taken as a form of graphical data and the URL is treated as a link to another menu).

Perkins and Hanson are combinable because they are both dealing with a GUI in relation to printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Perkins in view of Shin with the teachings of Hanson for the purpose of allowing for two way communications between a computer and a printer (Hanson: Column 2, lines 1-5).

Regarding Claim 6, Perkins in view of Shin does not teach wherein the printer driver is further configured to in response to detecting a user selection of the link, retrieve the bitmap data from the printing device and cause the bitmap data to be displayed on the graphical user interface.

Hanson teaches wherein the printer driver is further configured to in response to detecting a user selection of the link, retrieve the bitmap data from the printing device and cause the bitmap data to be displayed on the graphical user interface (Column 5, lines 23-43, where the bitmap data is taken as a form of graphical data and the URL is treated as a link to another menu).

Perkins and Hanson are combinable because they are both dealing with a GUI in relation to printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Perkins in view of Shin with the teachings of Hanson for the purpose of allowing for two way communications between a computer and a printer (Hanson: Column 2, lines 1-5).

6. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins (US 2003/0184782) in view of Shin (US 6,351,320) further in view of Allen (US 2004/0143651).

Regarding Claim 12, Perkins in view of Shin does not teach wherein: the configuration data includes first version identification data that indicates a version of the configuration data retrieved by the printer driver, and the printer driver is further configured to:

retrieve second version identification data from the printing device, wherein the second version identification data indicates a version of the configuration data maintained on the printing device,

compare the first version identification data to the second version identification data, and if the comparison of the first version identification data to the second version identification data indicates that the version of configuration data maintained on the printing device is more recent than the version of configuration data retrieved by the

printer driver, then the printer driver retrieving the more recent version of the configuration data from the printing device.

However, Taylor does teach wherein: the configuration data includes first version identification data that indicates a version of the configuration data retrieved by the printer driver (Page 4, paragraphs 35 and 36) and the printer driver is further configured to:

retrieve second version identification data from the printing device, wherein the second version identification data indicates a version of the configuration data maintained on the printing device (Page 4, paragraphs 35 and 36),

compare the first version identification data to the second version identification data (Page 4, paragraphs 35 and 36), and if the comparison of the first version identification data to the second version identification data indicates that the version of configuration data maintained on the printing device is more recent than the version of configuration data retrieved by the printer driver, then the printer driver retrieving the more recent version of the configuration data from the printing device (Page 4, paragraphs 35 and 36).

Perkins and Taylor are combinable because they both are dealing with working with printer drivers.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Perkins in view of Shin with the teachings of Taylor for the purpose of making sure that the client computer possesses the current printer properties (Taylor: Page 1, paragraph 9).

Regarding Claim 13, Perkins in view of Shin does not teach wherein the printer driver is configured to retrieve the configuration data from the printing device in response to an indication that the printer driver is not fully compatible with the printing device.

However, Allen does teach wherein the printer driver is configured to retrieve the configuration data from the printing device in response to an indication that the printer driver is not fully compatible with the printing device (Page 4, paragraphs 35 and 36).

Perkins and Taylor are combinable because they both are dealing with working with printer drivers.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Perkins in view of Shin with the teachings of Taylor for the purpose of making sure that the client computer possesses the current printer properties (Taylor: Page 1, paragraph 9).

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins (US 2003/0184782) in view of Shin (US 6,351,320) further in view of Vidyanand (US 6,967,728).

Regarding Claim 14, Perkins in view of Shin does not teach wherein the printer driver is further configured to: retrieve second configuration data from a second printing

device, and cause the second configuration data to be stored on the non-volatile storage device.

However Vidyanand does teach wherein the printer driver is further configured to: retrieve second configuration data from a second printing device (Column 3, lines 28-48) cause the second configuration data to be stored on the non-volatile storage device (Column 5, lines 23-28).

Perkins and Vidyanand are combinable because they both deal with installing printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Perkins in view of Shin with the teachings of Vidyanand for the purpose of providing transferable printer drive preferences (Vidyanand : Column 3, lines 18-24).

8. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins (US 2003/0184782) in view of Hanson (US 6,148,346).

Regarding Claim 15, Perkins teaches an apparatus (Page 1, paragraph 1) comprising:

a non-volatile storage device (Page 2, paragraph 21).

Perkins does not teach a printer driver configured to retrieve bitmap data from a printing device, and

cause the bitmap data to be stored on the non-volatile storage device; and

an application program to cause the bitmap data to be displayed on a graphical user interface.

Hanson does teach a printer driver configured to retrieve bitmap data from a printing device (Column 5, lines 13-22, where the bitmap data is taken as a form of graphical data), and

cause the bitmap data to be stored on the non-volatile storage device (Column 2, lines 22-28); and

an application program to cause the bitmap data to be displayed on a graphical user interface Column 5, lines 13-22).

Perkins and Hanson are combinable because they are both dealing with a GUI in relation to printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Perkins with the teachings of Hanson for the purpose of allowing for two way communications between a computer and a printer (Hanson: Column 2, lines 1-5).

Regarding Claim 16, Perkins further teaches wherein the graphical user interface is configured to facilitate printing of an electronic document (Page 2, paragraph 23 and Page 3, paragraph 35).

Regarding Claim 17, Perkins does not teach wherein the printer driver is configured to retrieve the bitmap data from the printing device in response to a user selecting a link on the graphical user interface.

Hanson does teach wherein the printer driver is configured to retrieve the bitmap data from the printing device in response to a user selecting a link on the graphical user interface (Column 5, lines 23-43, where the bitmap data is taken as a form of graphical data and the URL is treated as a link to another menu).

Perkins and Hanson are combinable because they are both dealing with a GUI in relation to printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Perkins with the teachings of Hanson for the purpose of allowing for two way communications between a computer and a printer (Hanson: Column 2, lines 1-5).

9. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins (US 2003/0184782) in view of Hanson (US 6,148,346) further in view of Wilson (GB 2,347,766).

Regarding Claim 18, Perkins in view of Hanson does not teach wherein the printer driver is configured to retrieve the bitmap data from the printing device in response to an indication that the printer driver is not fully compatible with the printing device.

Wilson does teach wherein the printer driver is configured to retrieve the bitmap data from the printing device in response to an indication that the printer driver is not fully compatible with the printing device (Page 5, lines 28-34, wherein the bitmap data is a part of the driver).

Perkins in view of Hanson and Wilson are combinable because they both are dealing with working with printer drivers.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Perkins in view of Hanson with the teachings of Wilson to allow the user not to have to deal with problems with the print driver when printing (Wilson: Page 6, lines 15-19).

10. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins (US 2003/0184782) in view of Hanson (US 6,148,346) further in view of Vidyanand (US 6,967,728).

Regarding Claim 19, Perkins in view of Hanson does not teach wherein the printer driver is further configured to:

retrieve second bitmap data from a second printing device, and

cause the second bitmap data to be stored on the non-volatile storage device.

Vidyanand does teach wherein the printer driver is further configured to:

retrieve second bitmap data from a second printing device (Column 3, lines 28-48), and

cause the second bitmap data to be stored on the non-volatile storage device (Column 5, lines 23-28).

Perkins in view of Hanson and Vidyanand are combinable because they both deal with installing printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Perkins in view of Hanson with the teachings of Vidyanand for the purpose of providing transferable printer drive preferences (Vidyanand : Column 3, lines 18-24).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas C. Pachol whose telephone number is 571-270-3433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thr, 8:00 a.m.- 4:00 p.m. (EST), Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on 571-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. C. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

12/03/09

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625